

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

---

**No. 24-5006**

**September Term, 2024**

**1:20-cv-03010-APM**

**Filed On:** February 21, 2025

United States of America, et al.,

Appellees

v.

Google LLC,

Appellee

Brad Greenspan,

Appellant

**BEFORE:** Pillard, Rao, and Childs, Circuit Judges

**ORDER**

Upon consideration of the motion for reconsideration, which the court construes to include a motion to recall the mandate; the motion for judicial notice; and the petition for writ of mandamus, it is

**ORDERED** that the motion for judicial notice be denied. Appellant’s motion is unnecessary to the extent that he asks the court to take judicial notice of official court records. See Veg-Mix, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric., 832 F.2d 601, 607 (D.C. Cir. 1987). And his other proffered documents are irrelevant to the disposition of this appeal. See Larson v. Dep’t of State, 565 F.3d 857, 870 (D.C. Cir. 2009). It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the motions for reconsideration and to recall the mandate be denied. The court’s inherent power to recall its mandate “can be exercised only in extraordinary circumstances.” Calderon v. Thompson, 523 U.S. 538, 549–50 (1998). And appellant has shown no such circumstances here. It is

**FURTHER ORDERED** that the petition for writ of mandamus be dismissed as moot.

**United States Court of Appeals**  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

**No. 24-5006**

**September Term, 2024**

The Clerk is directed to accept no further submissions from appellant in this closed case.

**Per Curiam**

**FOR THE COURT:**  
Clifton B. Cislak, Clerk

BY: /s/  
Daniel J. Reidy  
Deputy Clerk